

Interview Summary

Application No.

10/535,531

Applicant(s)

SCHLOSBERG ET AL.

Examiner

KARL J. PUTTLITZ

Art Unit

1621

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) KARL J. PUTTLITZ

(3) _____

(2) Andrew Griffiths

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 05 March 2009

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☐ Personal (copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant

2) ☐ applicant's representative

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: all

Identification of prior art discussed: Brunner

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The examiner and applicant's representative discussed the proposition that Brunner fails to teach or suggest a catalyst support comprising metallosilicate. The examiner also indicated a possible double patenting issue with 10/534075. Applicant will consider filing a Terminal Disclaimer.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Karl J. Puttlitz/
Examiner, Art Unit 1621